APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,811	08/07/2001	Francis De Smet	DESM3001/JEK	8897

23364 7590 04/22/2005		

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/922,811	SMET, FRANCIS DE
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cam Y T Truong	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _14 March 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-11 and 13-16_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-11 and 13-16_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _14 March 2005_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant has amended claims 1-11 and 15-16 in the amendment filed on 3/14/2005. Claims 1-11 and 13-16 are pending in this Office Action.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argued that Goedken does not teach "a human search assistant who assists in a search for information on the Internet". Goedken teaches that whenever an information request 18 from a requester 12 is received by the apparatus 10, the database manager 140 conducts a search of the knowledge database to find an answer for responding to the information request 18 from the requester 12. If the database manager 140 cannot retrieve an answer from a database 136, the information request 18 is passed to the selector 10 to initiate the preparation of an answer request message 20 to be routed to one or more information custodian 14. To address this issue, information custodians 14 are search knowledge database 136. If the custodian 14 finds an answer, he/she prompts the answer to the database manager to initiate the preparation of a final answer message24 for subsequent routing to the information requestor 12 (col. 19, lines 34-67; col. 20, lines1-30).

As seen above information, the information custodian assists the requestor 12 in searching to find an answer by searching the database 136. Thus, the information custodian is specialize in searching and can assist with searching.

Applicant argued that Goedken does not teach "a human search

assistant". Goedken teaches that from time to time an information request

message 18 will be routed to an information custodian 14 even though an answer

to that information request exists in the database 136. To address this issue,

information custodians 14 are preferably authorized to search the knowledge

database 136 for pre-existing answers. If the custodian 14 finds such an answer,

he/she is preferably authorized to add at least a portion of the current information

request message 18 to the knowledge database 136 as a synonym of the

previously stored request, and to prompt the database manager 140 to initiate

the preparation of a final answer message 24 comprising the previously stored

answer" (see col. 20, lines 20-30). In addition, "a information custodian 14 may

wish to limit the answer request messages 20 he receives to those where a

novice level reply is expected " (see col. 27, line, 39-41).

Clearly, the information custodian 14 is a human who is referred to as

"he/she".

Applicant argued that Goedken does not teach "a human search assistant

receives an information request and reformulates an information request for

searching the Internet with a search robot". Goedken teaches that in response to

a message from a first information requester 12 asking (How do bats see in the

dark?) as a first version, and information custodian 14 may include the question

synonym (How do bats use radar?) as a second version. In particular, the

information custodian 14 may amend the question segment 28 and/or he may

include a question synonym segment to facilitate subsequent automatic and/or

manual retrievals. The above information shows that the custodian 14 receives

an information request and reformulates the question of the requester 12 after

receiving the question of the requester 12. The amended question is

represented as an adapted information request (figs. 5&6, col. 20, lines 36-39;

col. 32, lines 55-58). Goedken also teaches as after receiving the question 18 of

the user 12, the information custodian 14 may amend the question segment 28

and/or he may include a question synonym segment to facilitate subsequent

automatic and/or manual retrievals and search an answer in the knowledge

database 136. The knowledge database 136 is stored in a portal 144 that

includes a first type of search engine 148. This search engine is typically

responsive to a query received from a searcher to search for web sites having

addresses on the Internet. If the custodian 14 finds such an answer, he/she is

authorized to prompt the database manager 140 to initiate the preparation of a

final answer message 24. For example, after receiving a question from user

name John_Doe indirectly, the custodian 14 or Dr_McWilliams provides an

answer including a web site that contains more information. The above

information shows that the custodian 14 applies the amended question to the

search engine 148 for accessing information in the knowledge database 136;

thus, the custodian 14 or Dr_McWilliams can provide an answer to the user

John_Doe indirectly (figs. 4-8&10, col.32, lines 55-58; col. 20, lines 25-31).

Applicant defined that "search robot" means "search program which can sour the

Internet in searching of the requested information" (page 1, lines 26-28). The

search engine is a program that searches for keywords in a database (Computer

Dictionary, page 424, col. Right, lines 30-33). Thus, the search engine 148 is

represented as the search robot.

For the above reason, examiner believed that rejection of the last office

action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1, 2, 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Goedken (US 6393423).

As to claim 1, Goedken teaches a method for searching information on the

Internet (col. 21, lines 45-47) comprising:

"providing a computer linked to the Internet" as (fig. 10);

"accessing at least one search assistant via the computer linked to the Internet to

search for information on the Internet" as the database manger 140, which

includes a search engine associated with the portal 144, is responsive to

information request 18 from a searcher or a user to search the knowledge

database 136 for a reply to the information request 18. If the database manger

140 is unsuccessful in its search, the selector 110 of the apparatus 10 could be

activated to initiate a search for an information custodian 14 that can rely to the

information 18. To answer this request, information custodians 14 are preferably

authorized to search the knowledge database 136 for pre-existing answer on the

Internet. For example, after Dr_McWilliams indirectly receives the information

request 18 of a user 12, the Dr_McWilliams provides an answer to the user

indirectly. The above information shows that the information custodian 14 or

Dr_McWilliam helps the user when searching information on the Internet. The

custodian 14 is represented as one search assistant (figs. 4-8& 10, col. 21, lines

64-67; col. 22, lines 1-7; col. 20, lines 20-24),

"wherein the at least one search assistant is human and specialist in searching

on the Internet" as from time to time an information request message 18 will be

routed to an information custodian 14 even though an answer to that information

request exists in the database 136. To address this issue, information

custodians 14 are preferably authorized to search the knowledge database 136

for pre-existing answers. If the custodian 14 finds such an answer, he/she is

preferably authorized to add at least a portion of the current information request

message 18 to the knowledge database 136 as a synonym of the previously

stored request, and to prompt the database manager 140 to initiate the

preparation of a final answer message 24 comprising the previously stored

answer" (see col. 20, lines 20-30). In addition, "a information custodian 14 may

wish to limit the answer request messages 20 he receives to those where a

novice level reply is expected " (see col. 27, line, 39-41).

Clearly, the information custodian 14 is a human who is referred to as

"he/she".

In particularly, Goedken teaches that whenever an information request 18

from a requester 12 is received by the apparatus 10, the database manager 140

conducts a search of the knowledge database to find an answer for responding

to the information request 18 from the requester 12. If the database manager

140 cannot retrieve an answer from a database 136, the information request 18

is passed to the selector 10 to initiate the preparation of an answer request

message 20 to be routed to one or more information custodian 14. To address

this issue, information custodians 14 are search knowledge database 136. If the

custodian 14 finds an answer, he/she prompts the answer to the database

manager to initiate the preparation of a final answer message24 for subsequent

routing to the information requestor 12 (col. 19, lines 34-67; col. 20, lines1-30).

As seen above information, the information custodian assists the

requestor 12 in searching to find an answer by searching the database 136.

Thus, the information custodian is specialize in searching and can assist with

searching;

"wherein the human search assistant reformulates a first information request of the user into an adapted information request associated with the first information request" as in response to a message from a first information requester 12 asking (How do bats see in the dark?) as a first version, and information custodian 14 may include the question synonym (How do bats use radar?) as a second version. In particular, the information custodian 14 may amend the question segment 28 and/or he may include a question synonym segment to facilitate subsequent automatic and/or manual retrievals. The above information shows that the custodian 14 reformulates the question of the requester 12 after receiving the question of the requester 12. The amended question is represented as an adapted information request (figs. 5&6, col. 20, lines 36-39; col. 32, lines 55-58),

"applies the adapted information request on at least one search robot for accessing information related to the first information request" as after receiving the question 18 of the user 12, the information custodian 14 may amend the question segment 28 and/or he may include a question synonym segment to facilitate subsequent automatic and/or manual retrievals and search an answer in the knowledge database 136. The knowledge database 136 is stored in a portal 144 that includes a first type of search engine 148. This search engine is typically responsive to a query received from a searcher to search for web sites having addresses on the Internet. If the custodian 14 finds such an answer, he/she is authorized to prompt the database manager 140 to initiate the

preparation of a final answer message 24. For example, after receiving a question from user name John_Doe indirectly, the custodian 14 or Dr_McWilliams provides an answer including a web site that contains more information. The above information shows that the custodian 14 applies the amended question to the search engine 148 for accessing information in the knowledge database 136; thus, the custodian 14 or Dr_McWilliams can provide an answer to the user John_Doe indirectly (figs. 4-8&10, col.32, lines 55-58; col. 20, lines 25-31). Applicant defined that "search robot" means "search program which can sour the Internet in searching of the requested information" (page 1, lines 26-28). The search engine is a program that searches for keywords in a database (Computer Dictionary, page 424, col. Right, lines 30-33). Thus, the search engine 148 is represented as the search robot.

As to claim 2, Goedken teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the human search assistant assists the user by searching on the Internet and indicates to the user where the information the user is looking for can be found in the World Wide Web or where the user should be looking on the World Wide Web or giving the user information found in the World Wide Web" as Dr_McWilliams helps John_Doe by searching on internet and indicates a web site http:www.bats.com/sonar for more information (figs. 4-8 &10, col. 20, lines 20-25; col. 20, lines 36-40).

As to claim 13, Goedken teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the human search assistant assists the user when searching for services" as information custodian 14 can reply or assist a user indirectly when the user wants to search websites via Internet. Websites are represented services (col. 21, lines 43-50; col. 22, lines 1-8).

As to claim 16, Goedken teaches the claimed limitation "including communicating with the user in the user's own language, with or without simultaneous translation" as when Dr_McWilliams receives a question: How do bats see in the darks in English language indirectly from John Doe via email, the Dr_McWilliams answers this question in English language. The above information shows that John Doe is served in his own language without simultaneous translation (figs. 4-8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goedken (US 6393423) in view of Hoffman (US 6366906).

As to claim 4, Goedken discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claimed 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the human search assistant makes use of search engines for searching on the Internet". Hoffman teaches that a user can select all provided search engines to search information on Internet (col. 8, lines 56-58; col. 10, lines 39-43, fig. 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hoffman's teaching of the user can selects all provided search engines to search information on the Internet to Goedken's system in order to allow human agents to specify search engines for finding specific information related to a user defined search term efficiently.

6.   Claims 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goedken (US 6393423) in view of Busey et al (or hereinafter "Busey") (US 6377944).

As to claim 3, Goedken teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the human search assistant has such expertise in searching on the Internet that the assistant can be considered a web librarian" as individuals, who have the expertise to quickly provide thorough, responsive and accurate information, is directed information request. Often time a person exists who knows where to locate and/or has custody of the information that interests a searcher. For example, if the searcher wants to know how bats see in the dark, a zoologist with a specialty in bats could very likely recommend a web page on point and/or

answer that question precisely and concisely in a matter of moments. A human

expert or a zoologist is represented as a search assistant who is human and a

specialist. The human expert or a zoologist is considered as web librarian (col.

1, lines 41-51; col. 8, lines 36-38), "is able to give more information than the

place to look on the World Wide Web" as (fig.8).

Goedken does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "is able to

supervise the user consulting the Internet". Busey teaches assuming that a

customer does not obtain an appropriate answer to his query then step 312 is

performed so that a human agent can be used to resolve the query. For

example, an inappropriate response may be where a query returns either no

match or a large number of possible matches. An agent supervisor or

administrator can set the default handling mechanism--allowing a customer to

browse a list of matches or to forward the existing, but insufficient, match to an

agent for resolution. If, for example, a display of a list of matches is the default,

the system executes step 318 to show the list. Else step 316 is performed to

create an online task and to invoke the WebACD as discussed below. The

customer can be allowed to reformulate the question before escalation to the

WebACD, as desired. The customer can be provided with a check box, button or

other web page control asking whether the answer is satisfactory. The above

information shows that the agent supervisor to supervise the user for consulting

(col. 10, lines 36-52).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Busey's teaching of assuming that a customer does not obtain an appropriate answer to his query then step 312 is performed so that a human agent can be used to resolve the query to Goedken's system in order to assist a user to improve searching/retrieving websites via Internet and further allow agents to solve user's particular problem immediately.

As to claim 5, Goedken discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "including conducting a dialogue between the user and the human search assistant on line and in real time". Busey teaches that the CIU manages the physical communications channels between customers and agents. In a preferred embodiment, the CIU module provides real-time text discussion, or chat, with multimedia extensions allowing agents and customers to interact immediately to solve a particular problem (col. 7, lines 5-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Busey's teaching of managing the physical communications channels between customers and agents and providing real-time text discussion or chat with multimedia extensions between agents and customers to Goedken's system in order to help a user to retrieve relevant websites following user's request quickly.

As to claim 6, Goedken discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 5, except the claimed limitation "including using voice recognition via the Internet to carry out the user's communication with the human search assistant".

Busey teaches an agent and customer communicate via a communication type that can be easily recorded, such as chat, the CIU can record the entire transcript (or a portion) of the dialogue and transfer the transcript to the WebACD for storing and future reference. Other communication types can be recorded, also, such as voice or IP voice. This can be accomplished by audio recording, by speech recognition, etc. Speech recognition is represented as voice recognition (col. 8, lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Busey's teaching of an agent and customer communicate via a communication type and using speech recognition to Goedken's system in order to recognize user's voice or vocabularies as spoken by users for helping users in searching information on the Internet efficiently.

As to claim 7, Goedken discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "including offering the user a visual representation of the human search assistant". Busey teaches when a customer receives an unsatisfactory answer, or no answer, a dialog box is provided where users can choose to (4) be queued for an online agent. The (4) be queued for an

online agent is a visual representation of the human agent (col. 12, lines 64-67; col. 13, lines 1-2).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Busey's teaching of when a customer receives an unsatisfactory answer, or no answer, a dialog box is provided where users can choose to (4) be queued for an online agent to Goedken's system in order to directly contact with an agent for assisting a user searching information on the Internet and further save time searching information on Internet.

As to claim 8, Goedken discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation "including consulting the human search assistant via a device selected from the group consisting of: a mobile phone, a palmtop, and an interactive television apparatus or the set-top box associated therewith". Busey teaches a palmtop device (col. 5, lines 45-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Busey's teaching of a palmtop device to Goedken's system in order to provide wider flexibility and greater capability and provide a portable personal device for storing information when traveling.

As to claim 10, Goedken discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 9, except the claimed limitation " enabling additional contact of the same

search assistant by the user by means of voice recognition, iris recognition or fingerprint recognition".

Busey teaches an agent and customer communicate via a communication type that can be easily recorded, such as chat, the CIU can record the entire transcript (or a portion) of the dialogue and transfer the transcript to the WebACD for storing and future reference. Other communication types can be recorded, also, such as voice or IP voice. This can be accomplished by audio recording, by speech recognition, etc. Speech recognition is represented as voice recognition (col. 8, lines 18-26).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Busey's teaching of speech recognition to Goedken's system in order to recognize user's voice or vocabularies as spoken by users for helping users in searching information on the Internet efficiently.

7.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goedken (US 6393423).

As to claim 9, Goedken discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except the claimed limitation " including using several human search assistants on a website". However, Goedken teaches web sites are stored in a knowledge database 136 that are accessed by many users via Internet. As shown in fig. 10, the portal 144, includes one or more apparatus 10. The apparatus 10 includes a second type of search engine 110, which is responsive

to an information request from a user. If the portal cannot find the suitable web

site to responsive to a request from a user, the selector of the apparatus 10 will

initiate a search for an information custodian 14 that can reply to an information

request from a user. The above information shows that this database allows

users to search a web site via the Internet at the same time. In case, when if

many users search a web site at the same time and the portal cannot find the

website to response to users' requests, the select of apparatus 10 has to initial

many custodians 14 to reply to users' requests. At this time, this web site is used

by the custodians 14. The custodians 14 are represented as human search

assistants (col. 21, lines 43-67; col. 22, lines 1-8).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Goedken's teaching of users can search

web sites via Internet and custodians can help users to search web sites in order

to provide answers to different users effectively and further eliminate network

traffic.

8.   Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Goedken (US 6393423) in view of Pickering et al (or hereinafter "Pickering") (US

6493695).

As to claim 11, Goedken discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in

claim 9, except the claimed limitation " including using one or more head human

search assistants having below them a number of specialized adjunct human

search assistants who each is specialized in one or more fields, and wherein the head human search assistant directs a call the head human search assistant receives towards one of those specialized adjunct human search assistants".

Pickering teaches the call center administrator may assign tasks or work to one or more selected agents 226 (or to all of them) by inserting an interaction 214 into the call center workflow. The interaction 214 may include a task or job to be performed by one or more agents 226. Such a task may be related to customer interactions or may be entirely independent thereof. The agents, who initially handle calls or tasks, will answer customer's question. The above information shows that the call center administrator has below her a list of agents who are specialized in one or more field to answer customers' questions. Agents are represented as human search assistants. The call center administrator is represented as a head human search assistant (col. 10, lines 1-7; col. 9, lines 49-51; col. 5, lines 11-13).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Pickering's teaching of the call center administrator assigns tasks to one or more selected agents by inserting an interaction 214 into the call center workflow to allow agents who answer questions of customer to Goedken's system in order to handle all user communications in a homogeneous or flexible manner for helping a user to search information on the internet.

9.   Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Goedken (US 6393423) in view of Ng (US 6405175).

As to claim 14, Goedken discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in

claim 13, except the claimed limitation "wherein said services comprise on-line

shopping, price and product comparison".

Ng teaches Internet shopping is powerful not only because of the lower

prices found. Many product reviews are posted on the Internet. The user can

read such product reviews at magazine review site 22. Some online malls 16 link

shoppers to these product-specific reviews, allowing shopper to compare

products as well as prices (col. 2, lines 38-42).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to apply Ng's teaching of the user can read product

reviews at magazine review site and allowing shopper to compare products as

well as prices to Goedken's system in order to allow users to find online products

with lower prices and further save user's money when shopping online.

As to claim 15, Goeken discloses the claimed limitation subject matter in

claim 1, except the claimed limitation "wherein the human search assistant

composes programs for the user comprising films, television or radio or music

programs which are provided via the Internet". Goedken teaches a human

assistant such as Dr_McWilliams helps a user in searching information on

Internet. Dr_McWilliams provides a webpage corresponding to the received

question from a user (figs. 4-8). Ng teaches users could post information about site to download movies (col. 14, lines 37-38).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Ng's teaching of downloading movies on the Internet to Goedken's system in order to provide relevance movies based on user's requests to a user quickly.

Conclusion

10.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cam-Y Truong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2162
4/14/2005

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER